



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/862,448	05/23/2001	Satoshi Iwata	1075.1167	8881
21171	7590	06/13/2007		
STAAS & HALSEY LLP SUITE 700 1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005			EXAMINER CAMPBELL, JOSHUA D	
			ART UNIT 2178	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 06/13/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/862,448	Applicant(s) IWATA ET AL.	
	Examiner Joshua D. Campbell	Art Unit 2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 April 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,5-13 and 17-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,5-13 and 17-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Amendment filed 4/9/2007.
2. Claims 1, 5-13, and 17-23 are pending in this case. Claims 1 and 13 are independent claims. Claims 4 and 16 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 5, 6, 13, 17, and 18 have been amended. Claims 21-23 have been newly added.
3. The objection of claims 4 and 16 under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim has been withdrawn due to the cancellation of those claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
5. Claims 1, 5-13, and 17-23 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Endo et al. (hereinafter Endo, US Patent Number 5,801,713, issued on September 1, 1998) as applied to claims 1 and 13 above, and further in view of Palmer et al. (hereinafter Palmer, US Patent Number 6,002,798, issued on December 14, 1999).

Regarding independent claim 1, Endo discloses a method in which a document made up of pages is displayed to user to be read (column 4, lines 6-47 of Endo). Endo discloses that a user may control the display state of the displaying section (column 4,

lines 6-47 of Endo). Endo also discloses a method in which each page may displayed as a whole or an automatic paging sequence that may be set to different speeds will automatically scroll the pages in succession based a display speed (column 2, line 42-column 3, line 50 of Endo). Endo discloses the ability for the user to select from the basic read mode and a plurality of automatic paging modes, this control ultimately controlling what is displayed and how it is controlled (column 3, line 29-column 4, line 63 of Endo). Endo discloses a method in which the document may be scrolled in at least two modes; A1 (cursory mode) which would allow for a user to read the page and view the outlines and A2 (general view mode) which is faster and would simply allow the user to get a good look at the page as a whole (Figures 3 and 4 and column 5, lines 15-25 of Endo).

Endo does not disclose a method in which only the titles and emphasized parts, which could be detected according to a predetermined condition such as font type and size, or only a layout-display are displayed from each page of the document during the viewing of the document. However, Palmer discloses a method in which a document display program will only extract and display the title of documents and a document element according to font type or size or the layout (structure) of documents based on the users preferences (Figure 6 and column 6, line 37-column 8, line 63 of Palmer). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the methods of Endo with the methods of Palmer because it would have allowed for rapid browsing of documents.

Regarding dependent claims 5-7, Endo does not disclose a method in which only the title, a layout-display, document element according to a predetermined condition such as font type and size, and that only an image would be extracted from each page of the document for display. However, Palmer discloses a method in which a document display program will only extract and display the title of documents, the layout of documents, a document element according to font type or size, or an image contained in documents based on the users preferences (Figure 6 and column 6, line 37-column 8, line 63 of Palmer). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the methods of Endo with the methods of Palmer because it would have allowed for rapid browsing of documents.

Regarding dependent claim 8, Endo does not disclose a method in which a page is displayed schematically by changing the display resolution. However, Palmer discloses a method in which changing the display resolution allows for more rapid viewing of a document with loss of quality, allowing a user to view the document as a schematic rather than a highest quality (column 1, line 30-column 2, line 54 of Palmer). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the methods of Endo with the methods of Palmer because it would have allowed for rapid browsing of documents.

Regarding dependent claims 9 and 10, Endo discloses a method in which the speed at which the pages are scrolled may be set in each mode (column 3, line 29-column 4, line 63 of Endo). Endo does not disclose that each display method is established in each mode. However, Palmer discloses a method in which each display

method may be individually established for the document viewing process (column 6, line 37-column 8, line 63 of Palmer). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the methods of Endo with the methods of Palmer because it would have allowed for rapid browsing of documents.

Regarding dependent claims 11 and 12, Endo discloses a method in which in which different modes may be selected and the paging display mode is based on the selections (column 3, line 29-column 4, line 63 of Endo). Endo does not disclose that the selection process consists of switches. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the method of Endo with a method of using switches because it was well known in the art at the time of the invention that a selection process as disclosed by Endo consists of a set of logic that is determined based on selections which could be thought of as virtual switches.

Regarding independent claim 13, the claim incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claim 1. Thus, the claim is rejected along the same rationale as claim 1.

Regarding dependent claims 17-20, the claims incorporate substantially similar subject matter as claims 5-8. Thus, the claims are rejected along the same rationale as claims 4-8.

Regarding independent claim 21, Endo discloses a method in which a document made up of pages is displayed to user to be read (column 4, lines 6-47 of Endo). Endo discloses that a user may control the display state of the displaying

Art Unit: 2178

section (column 4, lines 6-47 of Endo). Endo also discloses a method in which each page may displayed as a whole or an automatic paging sequence that may be set to different speeds will automatically scroll the pages in succession based a display speed (column 2, line 42-column 3, line 50 of Endo). Endo discloses the ability for the user to select from the basic read mode and a plurality of automatic paging modes, this control ultimately controlling what is displayed and how it is controlled (column 3, line 29-column 4, line 63 of Endo). Endo discloses a method in which the document may be scrolled in at least two modes; A1 (cursory mode) which would allow for a user to read the page and view the outlines and A2 (general view mode) which is faster and would simply allow the user to get a good look at the page as a whole (Figures 3 and 4 and column 5, lines 15-25 of Endo).

Endo does not disclose a method in which only the titles and emphasized parts, which could be detected according to a predetermined condition such as font type and size, or only a layout-display are displayed from each page of the document during the viewing of the document. However, Palmer discloses a method in which a document display program will only extract and display the title of documents and a document element according to font type or size or the layout (structure) of documents based on the users preferences (Figure 6 and column 6, line 37-column 8, line 63 of Palmer). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the methods of Endo with the methods of Palmer because it would have allowed for rapid browsing of documents.

Regarding dependent claim 22, Endo does not disclose a method in which only the title, a layout-display, document element according to a predetermined condition such as font type and size, and that only an image would be extracted from each page of the document for display. However, Palmer discloses a method in which a document display program will only extract and display the title of documents, the layout of documents, a document element according to font type or size, or an image contained in documents based on the users preferences (Figure 6 and column 6, line 37-column 8, line 63 of Palmer). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the methods of Endo with the methods of Palmer because it would have allowed for rapid browsing of documents.

Regarding dependent claim 23, Endo discloses that the time interval for paging may be changed by the user at any time (column 6, lines 17-23 of Endo).

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 4/9/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

7. In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re*

Art Unit: 2178

Jones, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the methods of Endo with the methods of Palmer because it would have allowed for rapid browsing of documents, which is clearly supported in column 8, lines 15-31 of Palmer. Thus, the rejection remains proper.

Conclusion

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joshua D. Campbell whose telephone number is (571) 272-4133. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (7:30 AM - 4:00 PM).

Art Unit: 2178

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JDC
May 29, 2007



STEPHEN HONG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER